

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending. Claims 1, 9, 17, and 24 have been amended. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application based on the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103

A. Claims 1-3, 5, 9-11, 13, 17, 18, 20, 24, 25, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Hofmann et al. (U.S. Publication No.2003/0184213) or alternatively under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Applicants Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim 1 recites, in part, a field emission display that includes a gate plate having gate holes of at least 10 um and a gate electrode around the top of the gate holes, said gate holes having an inclined inner wall.

In contrast, neither AAPA or Hofmann teach or suggest such a feature. Specifically, with the field emitter gate taught by Hofmann, it is not possible to manufacture a gate structure formed on an independent insulation substrate or a thick insulation layer (i.e., gate holes of at least 10 um), since the overall structure of Hofmann is very thin (less the several um). To achieve the structure recited in claim 1, the slanted hole must be formed on a thick insulation layer (see, for example, paragraphs 19-21). Although the gate electrode 15 disclosed in Hofmann is shown slanted, the gate insulation film (the insulation film inside the gate hole) is not slanted. Additionally, AAPA does not remedy at least this deficiency of Hofmann.

Accordingly, no combination of AAPA and Hofmann teach or suggest, a field emission display that includes a gate plate having gate holes of at least 10 um and a gate electrode around the top of the gate holes, said gate holes having an inclined inner wall, as recited in each of claims 1 and 17.

Claims 9, 17, and 24 are believed allowable for at least the same reasons presented above with respect to claim 1 since claims 9, 17, and 24 each recite features that are similar to the features of claim 1 discussed above.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 10, 11, 13, 18, 20, 25, and 27 are believed allowable for at least the reasons presented above with respect to claims 1, 9, 17, and 24 by virtue of their dependence upon claims 1, 9, 17, and 24. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

B. Claims 4, 6-8, 12, 14-16, 19, 21-23, 26, and 28-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Hofmann in view of AAPA and further in view of Konishi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,580,223). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 4, 6-8, 12, 14-16, 19, 21-23, 26, and 28-30 are believed allowable for at least the reasons presented above with respect to claims 1, 9, 17, and 24 by virtue of their dependence upon claims 1, 9, 17, and 24 and because Konishi does not remedy at least the deficiencies of Hofmann or AAPA discussed above with respect to claims 1, 9, 17, and 24. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.


Conclusion

Therefore, all objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney for Applicants at the telephone number indicated below in order to expeditiously resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

MAYER BROWN ROWE & MAW LLP

By: 
Yoon S. Ham
Registration No. 45,307
Direct No. (202) 263-3280

YSH/VVK

Intellectual Property Group
1909 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006-1101
(202) 263-3000 Telephone
(202) 263-3300 Facsimile

Date: July 26, 2006